ATTACHMENT II

LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGY INNOVATIONS FUND - PROGRESS REPORT

9/5/01

I DEPARTMENT/AGENCY
Louisiana Department of Education

II PROJECT TITLE
Department of Education WEB-based Data Warehouse System

III PROJECT LEADER
Steve Jungk, Department of Education, Education Data Center, 3455 Florida Blvd. Baton Rouge, La., 70806, Phone-225-342-2505, FAX 225-342-1524, sjungk@mail.doe.state.la.us

IV DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT
This is a project to develop and implement a WEB-accessed Education Data Warehouse (EDW). The overall goal of the system is to improve student achievement and teacher quality by providing educational administrators and teachers access to the data they need to make effective decisions. The primary system users are district principals and teachers as well as state and district administrators. Other users include legislators, community leaders and the public at large.

V PROJECT STATUS

A. Brief Summary

Developmental work on the project had proceeded somewhat slower than planned. Once the vendor was selected the process has kept close to schedule.

B. Accomplishments

- ?? The Request for Proposal (RFP) was mailed by State Purchasing on 8/18/00.
- ?? A Pre-Proposal conference was held on 8/30/00.
- ?? Bid opening was held on 10/27/00.
- ?? Vendor presentations were held 1/16/01 through 1/18/01.
- ?? Vendor selection made 2/28/01.
- ?? Contract signed 5/8/01.
- ?? Vendor kick-off meetings began 5/14/01.
- ?? Project planning phase completed 5/30/01.
- ?? Hardware/software purchase and implementation phase completed 6/20/01.
- ?? User interviews completed 8/20/01.
- ?? Design, construction and testing underway.

C. Problems Encountered/Action Taken or Planned

- ?? OCR and OSP had difficulty determining which PST would review our RFP. The original RFP was sent to OSP to be reviewed by their PST. OSP determined that the RFP should be reviewed by the OCR PST. The OCR PST determined that the RFP should be reviewed by the OSP PST. The OSP finally agreed to review the PST. This process took considerable time and required us to essentially write two RFPs, one under the OCR format and one under the OSP format. I would recommend that the two PST's merge since there are members that sit on both committees and the criteria used to determine jurisdiction between the two committees is extremely vague.
- ?? The hiring/budget freeze imposed on our agency reduced the available manpower we were able to muster in writing the RFP. This delayed the completion of the RFP.
- ?? The bid opening date was delayed three weeks since several prospective bidders requested a delay because of the complexity of the project
- ?? Another delay was incurred because of the need for more information from the top bidders. Presentations were set up, but the end-of-the-year holidays produced another two-week delay in the process, as the vendors were unable to schedule presentations until after the new year.
- ?? Delays were incurred because the nature of this award (being managed through OSP instead of OCR) presented procedural challenges to the LDE purchasing section.

D. Major Milestones (Original vs. Current Estimate)

Our original 80% completion figure was based on the RFP issuance sometime in May/June of 2000. The RFP was issued on 8/18/00. We had anticipated Proposal opening date to be sometime in July/August. The bid opening date was scheduled for 10/6/00, but it was delayed until 10/27/00.

The project is broken up into seven phases with the initial rollout to occur on 10/30/01 and the final phase to complete on 6/30/02. The following chart details these phases and indicates the status of each:

#	Phase	%	Est.	Actual
1	Project Planning	10	5/15/01	5/30/01
2	Hardware/Software Installation	20	6/15/01	6/20/01
3	System Design	10	8/15/01	
4	Construction/System Test	30	9/31/01	
5	Training	10	10/15/01	
6	Implementation and Acceptance	15	10/30/01	
7	Warranty	05	6/30/02	

It was estimated that the pre-award tasks comprised 10% of the effort and all subsequent work is 90% of the project. Although system design has fallen behind schedule this has not been a problem as construction of the EDW has begun and is proceeding concurrently. The delays in system design are expected to add one week to the process. The schedule is being reworked to "double up" more functions. Based on these estimated it is concluded that 47% of the project is complete.

VI COST VS. BUDGET

	Category	**Budgeted**	**Actual**	**Projected Surplus**
A.	Equipment	$ none	N/A	N/A
B.	Software	$ none	N/A	N/A
C.	Telecommunications	$ none	N/A	N/A
D.	Professional/ Contract Services	$ 1,000,000	$ 991,000	$ 9,000
E.	Other Costs	$ none	N/A	N/A
		========	=========	==========
	Total Project Cost	**$ 1,000,000**	**$ 991,000**	**$ 9,000**

VII ITEMIZED EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS INCURRED DURING THIS REPORTING PERIOD

Phase 1: $91,000

Team Mobilization and Orientation – Bring the contracted personnel on site and introduce them to the LDE staff who will be providing the functional support for this project. Introduce these new personnel to the various internal systems that are the sources of the EDW data.

Project Planning – Outline the schedule and key milestones that comprise the development and deployment of the EDW.

Hardware and Software Planning and Purchase – Procure a Sun Solaris server and Oracle 8i database that will serve as the backbone for the EDW.

Phase 2: $198,200

Hardware and Software Installation and Configuration – Implement the server and database; configure them for optimal usage as an internet-ready repository for education data.

Functional Test – Perform benchmarks to ensure optimal response time.